RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
NOV 3 0 2005

FAXED
NOV 8 2005

In the United States Patent and Trademark Office

Applicant: Sam Jang **Serial No.10/685,855** **Filed: 10/16/2003** **For CATHODE RAY TUBE CLAMP**	**Before the Examiner** **Zachary Pape** **Art Unit 2835**

Hon. Commissioner for Patents
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE

Sir:

Remarks

On November 9, 2005, the examiner issued an action wherein the Office Action Summary states:

> "2b) This action is non-final."

Page 2 of the Detailed Action states

> "Since the examiner has cited new art and set forth a new rejection, prosecution of the case has been RE-OPENED."

Page 5 of the Action states that

> "Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL."

Applicant discovered the possibility of this action being final on or about November 3, 2005, and telephoned the examiner to establish the status of the case, and learned that the examiner had intended to make the action final and he could not withdraw the final action in view of the confusing state of the record. Applicant has therefore had less than a week to respond to the outstanding action in view of the Office policy concerning final actions. Applicant respectfully objects to this final action, and this amendment is made under this time constraint.

Additionally, applicant submits that the action should not have been final in view of MPEP Sec. 706.07(f)(O).

Claim Rejection - 35 USC Sec. 103

Claims 18, 20 and 26 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Cha '348 in view of Wenk '918 and further in view of Park '118. Applicant notes that it is not presently possible to consider other possibilities for response, including perhaps the opportunity to swear back of Park '118, if available, because of the short time available to respond to the outstanding action.

Former base Claim 26 should be cancelled.

Base Claim 26 is now presented and amended as new base Claim 29, which adds the following new limitations:

> –a wing extending from said split ring in a direction substantially angularly disposed to said cathode ray tube neck,--
>
> –at least one of said stand-offs having a longitudinally extending stiffener rib arranged in a direction angularly disposed to said wing–.

and further limits said remote stand-off ends as

> –being spaced apart from said wing and ---

A new base Claim 30 is also now presented which includes the above new wing limitation contained in the above referred to new base Claim29, and additionally substitutes for the "stiffener rib" limitation formerly in rejected Claim 26 and in new Claim 29, the following new limitation:

> --at least one of said stand-offs having means for stiffened securement of said printed circuit board on said clamp–.

The wing was formerly the subject of now cancelled Claims 8 and 9, so no additional search is believed required.

The examiner has relied upon the Cha '348 reference to anticipate the clamp for connecting a printed circuit board or the like to the neck of a cathode ray tube, the clamp having a split ring for securing the clamp onto the tube neck and, according to the examiner, having "a plurality of standoffs extending from the split ring...". Applicant submits that Cha's "stand-offs" are merely flush tabs and do not provide connecting means for spacing the circuit board from the split ring. Cha's circuit board (1) is flush to the coupling device 20 or clamp and tube neck (4), and this interface connection gives greater risk to the printed circuit board than the remote connection in applicant's device. Further, while Cha has a "plate" (27) extending from the split ring, it isn't a "wing" as claimed, which can used to pinch (and leverage) the clamp closed around the neck of the CRT, while also serving as a spread apart surface for the stand-offs to securely seat the printed circuit board. Additionally, as now claimed, the stand-off ends for securing the printed circuit board to the clamp are spaced apart from the wings, and not on the plate as in Cha, making the connection of the printed circuit board to the clamp during assembly much easier to accomplish.

The examiner has relied upon the Wenk '918 reference to anticipate applicant's split ring clamp. However, Wenk fails to teach or suggest any wing, stand-off or other connection exterior to the clamp. Wenk relies strictly on the support elements (18) to close the clamp. Applicant's wings and stand-offs permit the clamp to be closed around the neck of the cathode ray tube by applying pressure to the wings and the sides of the stand-offs. This feature can be important when dealing with close space work in a monitor or television set where the clamp must be tightly affixed to the neck of the tube. The spreading of the wings and stand-offs also provides additional leverage for tightening the clamp around the tube neck. Wenk does not consider this problem with his clamp and Cha, which provides only a single open or close setting for the clamp, in no way considers the problem or its solution. Applicant further submits there is no basis in Wenk for combining it with

Cha.

The examiner has relied upon the new reference to Park to teach "connecting a printed circuit board to stand-offs comprising longitudinally extending stiffener ribs." Park's tabs are not standoffs and they do not stand off or extend longitudinally from wings or a clamp. As applicant understands Park, these tab-like ribs extend from the cover of a coil separator into apertures in a printed circuit board. Apparently, their purpose is to rigidly hold the circuit board next to the coil separator. Apparently, from the disclosure, the orientation of the circuit board is against the coil separator (assuming it is like a CRT) and not spaced apart from the CRT, as applicant's claimed design requires. Also, there is no suggestion or teaching in Park for providing a tightenable clamp for a CRT or utilizing stand-offs with ends remote from a clamp for spacing and connecting a printed circuit board remote from the CRT.

The claims as now presented are believed allowable, and early and favorable action is solicited.

Formerly allowable Claims 18 and 20, respectively, are now dependent upon new independent Claims 29 and 30, respectively. A total of four claims remain in the application.

All other claims formerly in this application have been cancelled. Only new claims 29 and 30 and their dependent Claims 18 and 20 remain in this application..

A Listing of Claims as required by the Rules follows.

Respectfully submitted,

Martin Faier, Attorney for applicant
REGISTRATION
NO. 20294

Faier & Faier, P.C.
566 W. Adams St. #600
Chicago, IL. 60661
Phone: 312/382-9500; Fax: 312/382-9200
Email: mmfaier@faier.com

CERTIFICATE OF SUBMISSION VIA FAX

I certify this paper is being submitted via fax phone to 571/273-8300, the fax phone number shown for Art Unit 2835 on USPTO.gov, where this application is pending, in accordance with the Rules, on November 8, 2005.

Respectfully,

Attorney